

Translation

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

RECEIVED

NOV 01 2002

PCT

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

10/009848

Applicant's or agent's file reference CARD1	FOR FURTHER ACTION See Notification of Transmittal of International Preliminary Examination Report (Form PCT/IPEA/416)	
International application No. PCT/FR00/01718	International filing date (day/month/year) 21 June 2000 (21.06.00)	Priority date (day/month/year) 22 June 1999 (22.06.99)
International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC B01L 3/00		
Applicant BIOMERIEUX S.A.		

1. This international preliminary examination report has been prepared by this International Preliminary Examining Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.	
2. This REPORT consists of a total of <u>4</u> sheets, including this cover sheet.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, i.e., sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis for this report and/or sheets containing rectifications made before this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT).
These annexes consist of a total of <u>4</u> sheets.	
3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:	
I <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Basis of the report
II <input type="checkbox"/>	Priority
III <input type="checkbox"/>	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
IV <input type="checkbox"/>	Lack of unity of invention
V <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
VI <input type="checkbox"/>	Certain documents cited
VII <input type="checkbox"/>	Certain defects in the international application
VIII <input type="checkbox"/>	Certain observations on the international application

RECEIVED
MAY 01 2002
TC 1700

Date of submission of the demand 05 December 2000 (05.12.00)	Date of completion of this report 02 October 2001 (02.10.2001)
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/EP	Authorized officer
Facsimile No.	Telephone No.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/FR00/01718

I. Basis of the report

1. With regard to the elements of the international application:*

- ☐ the international application as originally filed
- ☒ the description:
pages 1-18, as originally filed
pages _____, filed with the demand
pages _____, filed with the letter of _____
- ☒ the claims:
pages _____, as originally filed
pages _____, as amended (together with any statement under Article 19
pages _____, filed with the demand
pages 1-19, filed with the letter of 14 September 2001 (14.09.2001)
- ☒ the drawings:
pages 1/5-5/5, as originally filed
pages _____, filed with the demand
pages _____, filed with the letter of _____
- ☐ the sequence listing part of the description:
pages _____, as originally filed
pages _____, filed with the demand
pages _____, filed with the letter of _____

2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- ☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rule 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the international preliminary examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☐ contained in the international application in written form.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☐ the description, pages _____
- ☐ the claims, Nos. _____
- ☐ the drawings, sheets/fig _____

5. ☐ This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).**

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report since they do not contain amendments (Rule 70.16 and 70.17).

** Any replacement sheet containing such amendments must be referred to under item 1 and annexed to this report.

V. Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**1. Statement**

Novelty (N)	Claims	1-19	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	1-19	YES
	Claims		NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-19	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations

Compared to document US-A-5 863 502, which is the closest prior art and describes a card-type assay devi having a number of parallel reaction circuits, the main novel feature of Claim 1 is that the arrangement of valves for each level is constant for all the reaction circuits. This feature makes the card easier to use by optimizing the arrangement of the valves. None of the documents cited in the international search report addresses this specific problem or suggests the solution. Claim 1 is therefore considered to define a non-obvious alternative and meets the requirements of PCT Article 33(2) and (3). The same reasoning is valid for independent Claim 9, which relates to a device specifically designed for implementation of the claimed card by means of actuators that can be actuated separately. The industrial applicability is obvious (PCT Article 33(4)).